DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 906 HE 008 456

TITLE	Report No. 94 of the Task Force on State, Institutional and Federal Responsibilities in Providing Postsecondary Educational Opportunity to Service Personnel. Final Report and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80203
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees; *Cooperative Planning; Costs; Data Bases; *Educational Demand; Educational Needs; Educational Planning; *Educational Supply; Enrollment Projections; Federal Government; Government Role; Higher Education; *Military Personnel; *Post Secondary Education; State Government

ABSTRACT

Military personnel are identified as a new clientele for postsecondary education. Educational opportunities for this group depend on close cooperation among diverse agencies within the military, state and federal government, and postsecondary education. This report explores in detail the nature of the issue and the types of coordination and cooperation needed among military and civilian authorities. The task force recommends several actions to enhance educational opportunities available to military personnel at civilian postsecondary institutions. They include: (1) a strong leadership role to be played by the states; (2) protecting program quality in cooperation with accrediting agencies; (3) firm commitment at the national level and the establishment of a national advisory council; (4) local cooperation; and (5) establishment of guiding principles regarding education for members of the armed forces; and (6) construction of a reliable data base on projected enrollments and costs as well as other planning information for voluntary education programs. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132906

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Task Force on State, Institutional and Federal Responsibilities in Providing Postsecondary Educational Opportunity to Service Personnel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008456

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

JANUARY 1977

REPORT NO. 94

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Task Force on State, Institutional and Federal Responsibilities in Providing Postsecondary Educational Opportunity to Service Personnel

Report No. 94

Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado 80295
Warren G. Hill, Executive Director

January 1977

This report was submitted to and adopted by the ECS Steering Committee at its meeting on December 10, 1976 in Denver, Colorado.

Publication of the task force report was supported by funds from the Carnegie Corporation of New York through the Servicemen's Opportunity College.

Additional copies are available without charge from the Department of Postsecondary Education, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295; or the Servicemen's Opportunity College, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

State of Louisiana

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Baton Rouge

EDWIN EDWARDS
GOVERNOR

October 29, 1976

Honorable Jerry Apodaca
Governor, State of New Mexico
Chairman, Education
Commission of the States
Members of the Steering Committee
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

Dear Governor Apodaca and fellow Steering Committee Members:

I believe that education is essential today for a happy and productive life. I am proud to have served as chairman of the task force that wrote this report on maintaining educational opportunities for men and women in the military service. I serve as governor in a state with many military personnel and I can attest to the need for full commitment and cooperation among everyone involved in providing such opportunity.

This report goes to the heart of the matter. We can no longer work in isolation on federal, state, local and institutional levels. The problems demand that we put our minds together to address common needs. I think that one of the strengths of this document is that it not only calls for cooperation, it spells out some kinds of cooperation that make sense and can be implemented.

The report leaves me with one afterthought. Reports have a way of gathering dust on shelves. This one must not. Read it, think about the issues, assess the recommendations. But more important, help us make improvements in the real world where educational opportunity for military personnel is a current reality and a continuing need. It is time to put these ideas to work.

It is a pleasure to transmit this report to the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States for its consideration.

Sincerely,

Edwin Edwards

EDWIN EDWARDS
TASK FORCE CHAIRMAN

EE:bsa

CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal ii

Task Force Members iv

I. Summary and Recommendations 1

II. Background and Charge 4

III. Needs of the Military and of Military Personnel 7

IV. State Planning and Coordination 12

V. Civilian Institutions as a Resource 16

VI. Appendices

A. Cost Study 18

B. Resource Consultants Involved in Task Force Meetings 24

This task force was funded by the Carnegie Corporation through the Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC), a project jointly sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

TASK FORCE ON STATE, INSTITUTIONAL AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN PROVIDING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO SERVICE PERSONNEL

Chairman
The Honorable Edwin Edwards
Governor of Louisiana

Vice Chairman
Dr. T. Edward Hollander
Deputy Commissioner
Board of Regents, University of the State of New York

Members

The Honorable William P. Bittenbender
Chairman
New Hampshire State Board of Education

Dr. James G. Bond
President
California State University at Sacramento

Dr. Howard R. Boozer
Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

Dr. Paul H. Carnell
Assistant Director
Division of Institutional Development
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Calvin Dellefield
Assistant Chancellor
San Francisco Community College District

Mr. C. L. Dollarhide
Deputy Director, Education and Rehabilitation Services
Veterans Administration

Dr. Louis Kaufman
Executive Vice Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College System

Dr. Barbara Knudson
Center for Criminal Justice
Harvard Law School

Dr. William L. Maloy
Principal Civilian Advisor
Naval Education and Training Command

The Honorable Lucille Maurer
Assemblywoman, Maryland

Mr. Robert L. Raether
President
Wisconsin Association of Concerned Veterans Organizations

The Honorable Jeanette Reibman
State Senator and Chairman, Education Committee
Pennsylvania

Dr. Prezell R. Robinson
President
Saint Augustines College

Consultant Members

Dr. William Arceneaux
Commissioner of Higher Education
Louisiana State Board of Regents

Dr. William L. Israel
Director of Special Projects
Council of Chief State School Officers

Dr. James F. Nickerson
Project Director
Servicemen's Opportunity College
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Dr. Reginald Petty
Acting Executive Director
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A new clientele for postsecondary education: military personnel

One major challenge for postsecondary education today is to extend access and choice to a variety of clienteles that previously have had little involvement with higher learning. One clientele of growing importance is the large number of military personnel in the all-volunteer armed forces who are enrolling voluntarily in educational programs provided by civilian institutions. Compounding the problems of delivering educational services, a high proportion of these people are in the service for only a short time, during which they are highly mobile and usually residing outside of their home state. Their needs and their impact on institutions are becoming a major issue in postsecondary education and in the armed forces, but neither of these communities can solve the issue alone.

Many will enter postsecondary education through the military

The volunteer armed services depend on education as a recruitment tool (in contrast to education as a veterans' bonus). Given the scope of the military's recruitment effort, the military services will be a point of entry to postsecondary education for many young people. If some projections of the manpower needs and expectations of the military for volunteers are met, as many as one-third of the male high school graduates of the country may receive their introduction to postsecondary education while in the military. Many military bases today are in fact major educational centers in terms of numbers of students, range of programs offered and civilian institutions involved. Accordingly, it is critically important that postsecondary institutions and the states cooperate effectively with the military services to insure that the education members of the armed forces receive through voluntary education programs is of the highest quality. Equally important, the transition from military service to continuing postsecondary instruction should be as smooth as possible.

Protecting program quality

Educational opportunities for military personnel depend on close cooperation among diverse agencies within the military, state and federal government, and postsecondary education. This report explores in detail the nature of the issue and the types of coordination and cooperation needed among military and civilian authorities. In brief, the task force recommends the following actions in order to enhance educational opportunities available to military personnel at civilian postsecondary institutions:

A strong state leadership role

1. The states should play a strong leadership role, working with postsecondary institutions and the Department of Defense, in planning and coordinating educational opportunities for military personnel. The higher education executive officer should establish a statewide advisory committee in those states with major military installations, composed of military and institutional officials. The committee should be charged with developing a plan for statewide coordination of civilian educational services for military personnel; identifying needs and resources within the state; transmitting pertinent information to local bases and institutions; analyzing funding problems and issues; channeling policy suggestions from the national advisory council to state-level organizations and implementing agencies; and addressing any problems that might call for state assistance or resolution. The state should serve as a communicator and clearinghouse on matters pertaining to needs assessment and planning. Moreover, it should, by establishing a rational framework of state policy in support of postsecondary educational opportunities for military personnel, help military officials identify procedures and

standards of integrity that will insure program effectiveness. Finally, the state must carry out its legal responsibility to authorize institutions to operate, with a view toward protecting the interests of the individual consumers of educational services, in this case the men and women of the military.

Protecting program quality in cooperation with accrediting agencies

2. The states should identify ways to protect the quality of educational programs offered to service personnel in civilian postsecondary institutions, primarily through encouraging recognized accrediting agencies to strengthen their evaluation of off-campus and out-of-state programs and through reinforcing the functions of state approval agencies that authorize institutions to operate programs within state borders. There is a great need for joint state efforts and interstate cooperation in order to maintain effective educational opportunities for military personnel.

Some guiding principles

3. Taking note of (a) the important and valid role of educational opportunity in the recruitment of military personnel; (b) the large numbers of persons expected to be recruited to the all-volunteer armed services; (c) the importance of providing all high school graduates, including those who volunteer for military service, with the opportunity for postsecondary study; (d) the responsibility of our society to assist in human resource development of all its citizens, including those who volunteer to serve their country in the armed services; and (e) the growing pressure for fiscal reasons to restrict military education opportunity to technical and service-related programs, the states, the military and civilian postsecondary institutions should affirm and carry out the following principles with respect to the education for members of the armed forces:

a. Every member of the armed forces should be given the fullest possible opportunity for postsecondary education, comparable to that available to nonmilitary personnel.

b. Human resource development, including career objectives, should be the main premise for voluntary education programs in and for the military, and such a perspective should be viewed as essential to the overall education effort of the armed forces.

c. Postsecondary institutions should affirm or reaffirm their commitment to accommodate the unique needs of military personnel for flexibility in residency requirements, credit transferability and fiscal and other arrangements to facilitate a continued role for civilian postsecondary institutions in the voluntary programs of the armed services.

Commitment at the national level

4. The task force strongly supports a firm continuing Department of Defense commitment to designing the voluntary education program in the military services for the development of human resources, complemented by a military education program aimed exclusively at inculcating skills for military objectives. The Department of Defense, in conjunction with other federal authorities as appropriate, should develop a comprehensive and unitary set of policies, procedures and quality criteria for providing coordinated military-civilian educational services to military personnel. Included in this task should be the establishment of a national advisory council with representatives from the military, postsecondary education and from the state leadership, charged with reviewing the military-civilian working relationship in postsecondary education on a continuing basis. The joint council should serve in an advisory capacity to the Department of Defense, the postsecondary education community and the states. All policies and proce-

Establishment of national advisory council

dures relating to the provision of civilian postsecondary educational services to military personnel should reflect a balanced assessment of the compatibility of armed forces objectives and expectations with civilian institutional capabilities and needs.

5. Each branch of the armed forces should be encouraged to consider a range of options for increased cooperation and coordinated planning at the base level. At the same time, higher education officials at the state and institutional level should do everything in their power to include military education representatives in the higher education professional community, with an understanding that military bases constitute education centers serving large numbers of students and offering a variety of programs at the postsecondary level. One way the Department of Defense could assist in increasing local cooperation is by establishing a structure of base advisory committees, perhaps on a trial or limited basis at the outset. These committees, established in coordination with state officials and postsecondary institutions, would be designed to furnish counsel to base commanders concerning plans, needs, civilian institutional capabilities, evaluation and liaison. Such committees should include adequate representation from various types of civilian postsecondary institutions, including those offering educational services on the base, as well as appropriate representation from state agencies and accrediting agencies.

Establishing local cooperation

6. The states and the national advisory council should work together to construct a reliable data base on projected enrollments in and costs of voluntary education programs for military personnel, along with other appropriate planning information, to a level of detail that will be useful in policy and program formulation at the federal, state and institutional levels.

A reliable data base

II. BACKGROUND AND CHARGE

What is voluntary education in the military?

Inservice voluntary education for military personnel has become a substantial enterprise with major impact on the budgets of the Department of Defense and civilian postsecondary institutions. One part of this enterprise, the voluntary civilian education programs made available to military personnel through the armed forces, is extended to a large clientele of highly mobile students attending public and nonpublic postsecondary institutions in every state of the nation. Civilian education available to members of the armed forces on a voluntary basis is designed to meet personal goals and also to complement military education and training so as to achieve career goals and meet service needs. The Department of Defense provides the major financing for voluntary education with a tuition assistance program for military personnel to encourage them to study at civilian institutions. The program covers up to 75 percent of tuition charges for such study. The balance of costs and other fees and expenses is borne by the student.

The educational opportunity available to military personnel through existing voluntary education programs should enhance their effectiveness as military personnel and additionally aid recruitment. A chance to get an education or learn a skill is one of the foremost reasons given by recruits for joining the all-volunteer armed forces. Voluntary education programs, in addition, result in higher retention rates within the military. At the same time, military personnel have special needs for administrative, fiscal and program flexibility. They are a diverse group whose educational needs cover the spectrum from college and graduate study to technical and vocational training to precollege and remedial work. They are a mobile group, dependent upon interinstitutional arrangements for access, nontraditional studies and services and transferability of credit. As a group, military personnel are also restricted in their choice of educational institutions to those available on or adjacent to their duty station.

Increasing access to postsecondary education

Taken together, these issues tie into the broader issue of educational opportunity for all the diverse clientele that make up our society. Among the continuing concerns facing postsecondary institutions, the states and the nation is that of increased access to postsecondary education. Of particular importance to state and national interests, therefore, is access to such education on the part of military personnel and the continuity of educational opportunity when such personnel leave the military and become veterans. While there is more than a 30-year history of cooperation between institutions and the armed forces, until recently there has been little in the way of structured relations that would insure continuity of programs, credits, records and advisement. There are substantial issues relating to decision making and management of postsecondary institutions in serving the educational needs of military personnel, whether by instruction carried to a base or installation or through the various means of external study now available in postsecondary education.

Servicemen's Opportunity College

In 1972, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges developed, with funding from the Carnegie Corporation, the two-year Servicemen's Opportunity College (SOC), a network of junior and community colleges making special efforts to meet the needs of military personnel. The institutions involved agreed to a set of criteria for more flexible means by which military personnel could satisfy admissions to programs, meet "on-campus" residency requirements, complete interrupted work, validate much of

service training and experience for credit and solve other problems. The idea met with immediate acceptance by the military and the institutions. As a result, in 1973 the four-year Servicemen's Opportunity College was inaugurated under the auspices of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in cooperation with the military and 12 organizations, including the Education Commission of the States (ECS). The project was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Department of Defense. The two- and four-year Servicemen's Opportunity College projects have now merged, jointly funded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Department of Defense, and the funding for the united project has been increased. The Education Commission of the States endorsed the project and currently has a representative on the advisory board. The commission has helped by distributing the Servicemen's Opportunity College catalogue to state officials and other commission members.

Origin of the task force

At the March 1974 meeting of the ECS Steering Committee, James F. Nickerson, director of the Servicemen's Opportunity College and a former ECS commissioner representing the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, reported on the progress of SOC to date and proposed the development of a joint SOC-ECS task force to explore policy issues for institutions, states and the federal government (represented by the military) relating to planning, financing, continuity and mutual obligations to meet the educational needs for servicemen. The Steering Committee endorsed the idea of such a task force and authorized its development as funding would permit.

Task force charge

In March 1975 the ECS Steering Committee endorsed a specific plan and scope of activity for the effort and charged the task force with three responsibilities:

1. To explore policy and procedural options for delegation of responsibility among educational institutions, state agencies and the military services.

2. To explore policy and procedural options for long-term financing of civilian education for military personnel.

3. In the context of education for service personnel by civilian postsecondary institutions, to explore problems of transferability of credit, extension of access and program flexibility as these relate to statewide and regional planning for postsecondary education and to orderly decision making among institutions.

Task force representation

The issues addressed by the task force were to cut across public and private, lower-division and upper-division and academic and vocational or technical education. The scope of inquiry included jurisdictional and cost-quality issues among in-state institutions as well as out-of-state institutions. Through such a task force, it was hoped that a national and prestigious group, representing governors, legislators, postsecondary institutions, state agencies, the military forces and federal agencies such as the Veterans Administration and the U.S. Office of Education, would address these issues and offer recommendations for the orderly development of civilian-military arrangements as institutions assume their share of responsibility for providing educational services to military personnel wherever they may be assigned. The task force was duly appointed and, under the chairmanship of Governor Edwin Edwards of Louisiana and vice-chairmanship of T. Edward Hollander, deputy commissioner of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, the task force held its first meeting in Baton Rouge on August 5, 1975.

The role of ECS

Since education is primarily a state responsibility, it is particularly appropriate that the task force was constituted under the aegis of the Education Commission of the States. Because of the commission's broad political and educational base in the states, it was felt that the task force could approach its charge with the breadth of analysis and purpose necessary to achieve workable results. Further, because the state provides a key link in the federal-state-institutional governance of education at the postsecondary level, the commission would serve as a viable point of departure for coordination, communication and implementation of any needed changes in the states. With its knowledge of state-institutional patterns of governance and administration, the commission and its constituency would serve to keep task force deliberations within bounds of what is politically feasible.

From its very first meeting and throughout its year of research, discussions, review and synthesis, the task force has agreed unanimously that the cooperation between the military forces and civilian postsecondary institutions, which has already been enhanced by such efforts as the Servicemen's Opportunity College, needs to be strengthened with a broad-based consensus on the goals and expectations of voluntary education for military personnel.

III. NEEDS OF THE MILITARY AND OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The needs of military personnel

Availability, flexibility, comparability, quality, acceptability by civilian standards — these, in a nutshell, are what members of the armed forces ask of their voluntary education programs while in the military. Military personnel as a group are as diverse as all students, yet their participation in voluntary education hinges on factors that generally do not impede other students. Their mobility within a worldwide military command, for example, means that they probably cannot expect to finish any degree program in a given setting. As they move from base to base, they may find that they cannot continue a program of study they initiated elsewhere, and when they return to civilian life, they may find that civilian institutions do not accept the credits and experience they acquired while in the military. These problems are all the more serious because many military personnel are making career as well as educational decisions as they move through a critical formative stage of life. Thus, they demand relevance both to their personal needs and to the exigencies of the world of work.

The needs of military personnel also extend to counseling services, policies allowing program access to dependents, special programs for disadvantaged students (e.g., precollege and high school equivalency programs), adequate provision for financial assistance, timely and relevant information about availability of programs and inservice career training to develop specific marketable skills. The military long ago made the decision to rely heavily on civilian institutions to provide some of these services within the context of voluntary education programs. Until recently, however, no concerted nationwide effort of the scope required has been made by civilian and military authorities to guarantee the effectiveness of such programs. A cooperative effort at the federal, state and institutional levels is essential now in order to extend and refine the steps already taken by the Servicemen's Opportunity College, the military and other groups and individuals.

The needs of the military

The military itself has critical needs that must be met. Some of those needs, such as availability and flexibility, overlap with the needs of military personnel. The military is concerned that courses offered by civilian institutions are adaptable to military schedules and locations. Because the military attracts recruits partially through the quality and relevance of educational offerings, it has an interest in obtaining high-quality services from civilian institutions. The military also has great need for talented and skilled individuals to perform the many, sometimes technical, often highly challenging tasks of the modern armed forces.

The military's needs are not homogeneous by any means. There are four major branches of the armed forces, each with a distinct operational environment, a different cross-section of personnel and, to some extent, a unique command structure. What might work in the Army could prove ineffective in the Navy. The educational needs of the Air Force, with its extremely high proportion of high school graduates, differ markedly from those of the Marines, where achievement of a high school diploma is a goal for a large proportion of recruits. Thus, each service branch has adopted its own approach to serving the postsecondary educational needs of its personnel, with some elements common to all.

One program in the Army, the Army Help for Education and Development Project (AHEAD), provides a liaison between postsecondary institutions and the Army, so that an enlistee can identify with a hometown school, take courses

anywhere in the world while serving in the Army and then complete the coursework and graduate from the hometown school. The Air Force coordinates its programs through the Air Force Education Services Program. Within this, it operates the Community College of the Air Force to integrate off-duty education with life in the service and with the long-term career goals of military personnel. The focal point for voluntary education in the Navy is the overarching management system designated the Navy Campus for Achievement (NCFA). This system utilizes a network of professional civilian education specialists to serve as advisors to Navy personnel. Among the several programs under NCFA is the Program for Afloat College Education (PACE) developed to provide formal educational opportunities to those at sea. It also includes a specially designed degree and certificate program in cooperation with 20 two- and four-year colleges and universities located at areas of Fleet concentration. The Marine Corps program, known as the Voluntary Education Program, includes educational offerings from high school completion through graduate education.

Benefits that have been available under the G.I. Bill

Other major efforts of the military to expand educational opportunities include the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES), a center for coordinating and supporting a variety of nontraditional and self-study opportunities; an extensive counseling program involving more than 2,500 counselors and education service officers; and an educational assistance program covering up to two thirds of tuition costs. Under the G.I. Bill, the serviceman may use his entitlement for educational expenses after completion of six months of service and while still in the service. Additional counseling and work opportunities are available to the veteran under the G.I. Bill, administered by the Veterans Administration, and the Veterans Cost of Instruction Program administered by the U.S. Office of Education. The Predischarge Education Program (PREP), a $50 million adjunct to the G.I. Bill, provides assistance to enable men and women in uniform to complete high school or to overcome educational deficiencies so they can undertake further education and training.

Note, however, that Congress has recently curtailed the PREP program and other G.I. Bill benefits with the passage of Senate Bill 969 and its counterpart in the House of Representatives, Although Congress terminated the old G.I. Bill for all men and women entering the service after January 1, 1977, it established instead, on a limited test basis (five years), an "educational pension plan" whereby recruits in the future will be able to set aside part of their pay to be used for educational tuition and expenses after they leave the service, at which time every dollar they contribute will be matched by two federal dollars from the Veterans Administration. For veterans entering the service before January 1, 1977, Congress provided an 8 percent cost-of-living increase in benefits under the G.I. Bill and extended the period of eligibility from 36 to 45 months. Other provisions of the new bill increased the number of regulations applying to postsecondary institutions that enroll veterans, including a provision restricting the number of students receiving federal support (including veterans) in any one program to 85 percent of the total number of students enrolled in that program.

Adding up the educational opportunities available to military personnel, it is little wonder that recent studies have shown that a chance to get an education is one of the foremost reasons given by recruits for joining one of the branches of the armed forces. The value of voluntary education programs, including G.I. Bill benefits, represents a more substantial student-aid program than is usually available to students in the civilian sector. The scope of these programs is extensive, both in numbers of students served and the dollars these

students bring to programs offered by civilian institutions. Thus, the need exists for coherent and consistent policies at the federal level to govern program operations. Some programs operate on base, some off base. Some operate within the state of the home institutions, while others operate out-of-state and worldwide. For military personnel and for the military, effective coordination and reliable regulation are essential.

Military bases as federal enclaves

The military has additional needs that stem from the special legal status and geographic distribution characterizing its operations. Military bases are considered federal reserves or enclaves, which are often set apart from major urban centers and areas where large numbers of postsecondary institutions operate (e.g., New England). The separation gives rise to special problems of access and choice for personnel seeking diverse educational options. The fact that this difficulty is overcome in many instances by inviting or authorizing programs from distant institutions onto the base means that the tasks of making informed choices, exercising quality control and conducting realistic evaluations become difficult indeed. The federal enclave status can result in a differential classification of program participants into military personnel, spouses, civilian employees and qualified publics in the surrounding community, and this classification can cause further administrative difficulties when federal (G.I. Bill), state and local laws and ordinances, as well as funding and regulatory mechanisms at every level, are considered.

Furthermore, base commanders often have substantial autonomy to plan and administer voluntary education programs as they see fit, including the selection (within military procurement regulations) of which institutions can offer programs. However, they operate under guidelines promulgated by the headquarters of their representative services. These range from policy guidance in the Navy to approval of local commanders' voluntary education plans by Air Force headquarters.

The Servicemen's Opportunity College has helped in articulating a consistent set of criteria by which civilian postsecondary institutions are recognized for participation, but the SOC effort has only been part of a much larger cooperative endeavor that needs to take place if the integrity of programs is to be guaranteed. Such an endeavor cannot take place only in the nation's capital or only in the offices of base commanders and their education officers. It must be worked through with the decision makers involved at the state level, in postsecondary institutions, in accrediting bodies, in federal education agencies and in the military. Most of all, all parties involved need to have an acceptable set of ground-rules on which complex planning decisions and mechanisms for cooperation can be based.

There are different standards for institutional operations in the states

One example that illustrates this need is the problem created for the military by the different standards for institutional operations in the different states, that is, the noncomparability of educational services and policies from state to state. No single base commander, institution or state can do much to alleviate this problem. Even within a single state, the multiplicity of institutions with which the military must deal is staggering. The military must consider not only the pertinent questions of educational quality and relevance, but also the military scheduling, base security and many more complications of a logistical nature.

Fully cognizant of the range of needs and problems confronting military personnel and the military in general, the task force recommends that the Department of Defense develop, in conjunction with the other federal authorities as appropriate, and in consultation with state and institutional representatives, a comprehensive and unitary set of policies, procedures and quality criteria for providing coordinated military-civilian educational services

to military personnel. Included in this task should be the establishment of a national advisory council on voluntary education in the military, with representatives from the military postsecondary education and from the state leadership, charged with the responsibility of reviewing the military-civilian working relationship in postsecondary education on a continuing basis. The task force has noted the positive contribution already being made by the Department of Defense Study Group, an informal liaison committee bridging the military and the higher education communities in Washington, D.C., and believes that this effort should be broadened, formalized and tied more integrally into policy formulation and evaluation of the voluntary education programs in the military. In addition to general policy oversight and assistance, the national advisory council would focus on military programs and degree needs; the problem of classified materials in relation to voluntary education programs; articulation of respective responsibilities among federal, state, institutional and base authorities; criteria and standards for programs, including national guidelines on quality evaluation policies and procedures; review of issues involved in the relation of the military to postsecondary education; and any other issues or policy matters relating to voluntary education for which there might be a need for advice and assistance.

Building commitment at the national level

One contribution the joint national advisory council could make is to help establish the ground rules and policy criteria for discussion of the totality of voluntary education programs on military bases, so as to encourage policies and procedures that treat the base as an education center rather than as a fortuitous aggregation of education programs. Such policy criteria should point to options the military services might consider for maintaining and upgrading adequate planning and needs assessment, methods for reviewing program quality and appropriations on an ongoing basis and other aspects of education decision making. It is suggested that such a group be appointed as a 15-member council under the auspices of the American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States, in coordination with the Department of Defense. Alternatively, the council should be constituted as a Presidential commission. Started initially with matching federal and foundation funds, the council would have as one of its responsibilities the establishment of a permanent funding base.

One alternative for local program coordination is base advisory committees

For another and more detailed level of assistance in policy making and administration of voluntary education programs, the task force recommends that the Department of Defense consider, as one alternative, authorizing base advisory committees for every base or installation operating a sizable voluntary education program. Such committees, representing various types of postsecondary institutions, including representatives of institutions offering educational services on the base, as well as appropriate representation from state agencies and accrediting agencies, would be designed to advise the base commander to insure coordination and thorough review of plans; to help assess the educational needs of the base and appropriate civilian capabilities; to help devise means for effective evaluation of programs on the base; and to insure liaison with institutions, state agencies and accrediting agencies.

The task force would also like to suggest another alternative that would focus primarily on program evaluation. Each base commander could be encouraged by Department of Defense policy to bring in a third-party team to conduct an evaluation of base programs every two years. Such an outside analysis would differ from the site visits of an accreditation agency in that the assessment would be geared to the base as an education center, to the coherence and integrity of the whole complex of voluntary education programs, and to how the programs fit student needs, relate to each other and

to the educational goals of the base, instead of being geared only (as is accreditation) to the institutions operating programs on the base.

Recognizing that both the local advisory committee and the third-party evaluation concepts may hinge upon economic factors within increasingly tight budget constraints, the task force recommends more generally that the military take whatever steps are feasible to encourage cooperation, better information and evaluation at the base level. Whatever mechanisms are used, the task force reiterates its suggestion that the Department of Defense and the national advisory council move to develop a systematic policy framework, including provisions for cooperation and assistance from state and institutional authorities, for providing coordinated military-civilian educational services to military personnel through the voluntary education program.

IV. STATE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Coming to grips with the state responsibility

Education has constitutionally and historically been primarily a state responsibility. Thus, one thread running through all the discussions of the task force was that the states have the responsibility, through statewide planning and coordination, to insure that high-quality educational services are available to military personnel at civilian postsecondary institutions. This responsibility encompasses several important tasks, not the least of which is close communication with the national advisory committee and with military authorities in charge of voluntary education programs in the armed forces, so that accurate fiscal and enrollment projections as well as projections of the state's educational resources available to meet military needs can be developed in a common format and exchanged on a timely basis. The task of communication entails maintaining active liaison and encouraging reciprocal relationships. Another critical task for state governments is that of encouraging flexibility in rules and regulations with respect to transferability of credit, time limitations on study, residency requirements and other aspects of postsecondary education policy at the state and institutional levels. For both of these tasks — communication, including collection of appropriate planning data, and flexibility in rules and regulations — the task force feels strongly and unanimously that the states should play a vigorous leadership role.

Relation to nontraditional education

The problems and opportunities growing out of voluntary education programs in the military are, from the states' vantage point, not an isolated phenomenon. Recent developments in nontraditional education have caused rapid development of state and institutional policy to facilitate student access and choice. Off-campus programs, external degrees, credit for experience and other new features of postsecondary educational opportunity in the states are clearly related to many of the key concerns involved in operating effective voluntary education programs in the military. Moreover, all of these developments taken together are but one component in the expansion of postsecondary education over the last two decades, an expansion that has made the state planning and coordinating role a necessity. The growth of statewide governing boards and planning and coordinating commissions over the last three or four decades, for example, has reflected the general need for an enhanced state role in postsecondary education, as well as the willingness of states to meet this need. In the larger view, then, the problems and opportunities of voluntary education programs in the military are entirely appropriate for consideration and action at the state level.

The states are not now meeting their full responsibility. Many state agencies and boards within each state are in a position to assist the military as appropriate in planning and coordinating voluntary education services for military personnel. However, these boards and agencies are often too fragmented and insular to communicate effectively with the military on overall problems and long-term needs. Inasmuch as they are fragmented, state officials often make it difficult for military authorities to know to whom they should communicate needs and information. Fragmentation also precludes statewide assessment of resources of the fiscal impact of programs as well as other planning information. To the extent that some states possess administrative policing powers with respect to the legality of civilian programs serving military personnel, these powers may be dissipated by a lack of knowledge or concern because of the complexity and compartmentalization of postsecondary education governance at the state level.

The task force reiterates its belief that the states should play a vigorous leadership role, but at the same time recognizes that specific mechanisms will be necessary to spur coordinated state involvement, both formal and informal, in insuring that adequate civilian programs are available to military personnel. It is recommended that the state agency primarily responsible for postsecondary education in each state serve as the anchor point for communication on behalf of the state with base commanders and other military personnel responsible for voluntary education programs. To carry this out, the higher or postsecondary education board through its executive officer in each state with sizable military presence should set up a statewide advisory committee composed of military and institutional officials, charged with developing a plan for statewide coordination of civilian educational services for military personnel; identifying needs and resources within the state; transmitting pertinent information to local bases and institutions; analyzing funding problems and policy issues; channeling policy suggestions from the national advisory council to state-level organizations and implementing agencies; and addressing any problems that might call for state assistance or resolution. Moreover, the state agency, which has statutory or constitutional responsibility for postsecondary education in the state, should take leadership in encouraging formation of the base advisory structures described in Section III of this report. State policy or guidelines in support of these structures, worked out in conjunction with the Department of Defense and civilian institutions, may be the first step insofar as the state agency is concerned, but communication and sharing of information would be essential at every step. The task force feels that the state role extends beyond the strict legal limits of involvement in licensure.

Using the state agency as an anchor point for communication

Unless there is a clear and supportive policy and procedure framework at the state and federal levels, both the military and civilian postsecondary institutions will encounter difficulty in operating voluntary education programs on a continuing basis and on the large scale required. Beyond the tasks of coordinating communication, providing flexibility and insuring that there is an effective policy and procedural framework, each state should examine funding options it may be able to provide in order to enhance the federal commitment. Some states have done so by granting resident status, and thus eligibility for lower tuition rates at public institutions to out-of-state residents who serve on a military base within the state. Each state should analyze the entire funding situation for voluntary education programs and then act, to the extent of its capacity, to maximize the educational opportunity available to military personnel and to provide articulation among diverse funding sources for the benefit of military personnel. It is also suggested that each state consider granting resident status for educational purposes to all military personnel based in the state. One issue that will come before the national advisory council, therefore, is interstate equity and the differential cost impact on states. It may be that a system of federal redistribution or financial assistance to compensate for fiscal impact will be necessary. The state has a particular responsibility to accomplish this task for its own residents, but the need does not stop there.

States should provide articulation among diverse funding sources for the education of military personnel

In financial and interinstitutional coordination, the states can help significantly in articulation among various levels and types of education. Specific problems that the states will need to scrutinize in this regard include the price differential of public versus private education, transfer and reciprocity problems and the proper role of vocational and technical programs for addressing military needs. In particular, the state agency primarily responsible for postsecondary education can assist in identifying and coordinating educational resources available to military personnel through postsecondary

institutions in the state. The state can also take the lead in articulating responsibilities between and among different levels of education, from high school or equivalency programs through postgraduate programs as appropriate.

The problem of program quality

Underlying many of the particular types of assistance the states can provide is the general problem of insuring program quality. The current range of problems in administering and coordinating voluntary education programs is especially pressing when viewed from the standpoint of the individual consumer of those educational services. As noted earlier, the task force found in its review of existing Department of Defense policies that the procedures for selection of civilian institutions are generally delegated to the military installation level and that, while all the services require or involve regional accreditation for selecting institutions, there are varying degrees of rigor and consistency in application. The task force is acutely aware of the problem of "entrepreneurial outbidding" among some civilian institutions, especially when such institutions establish out-of-state extension and branch programs without adequate planning, supervision or evaluation. Since each branch of the armed forces operates its own programs separately, using varying procedures and methods of funding, the proper balance between control and autonomy has been difficult to achieve. Against this background, it should also be recognized that many postsecondary institutions have in the past not moved to meet the needs of military personnel. The result has been much fragmentation and inconsistency of approach.

The quality issue underscores the need for a more comprehensive approach to relating military needs and civilian institutional capabilities. Key junctures at which quality control can take place include licensure and certification, decision making at the base or installation level, accreditation and periodic review and, woven throughout these areas, the criteria and regulations accepted by all parties involved as definitive from the perspective of the military and military personnel. As discussed in Section III, the task force feels that the national advisory council and the military should take the initiative, working with civilian institutions and state officials, to generate criteria for program quality.

The state role is threefold

The state role is threefold. First, the state can help by serving as a communicator and clearinghouse on matters pertaining to needs assessment and planning. Second, by establishing a rational framework of state policy in support of postsecondary education for military personnel, the state can help military officials identify procedures and standards of integrity that will insure program effectiveness. This state responsibility will be particularly crucial in handling branch or extension programs operating in the state, including those of out-of-state institutions. Third, the state must carry out its legal responsibility to authorize institutions to operate, with a view toward protecting the interests of the individual consumers of educational services, in this case the men and women of the military. The states can assist further by encouraging accrediting agencies to carry out their full responsibility in assessing postsecondary institutions by scrutinizing the off-campus and out-of-state programs of each institution.

With regard to the first two responsibilities, both aimed at cooperation, the task force notes the important role already being played by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, which among other things has written guidelines for helping accrediting agencies in approving nontraditional programs and branch institutions, as well as the Office of Educational Credit of the American Council on Education, which determines credit equivalency for military courses so that military personnel can obtain credit at civilian institutions for skills acquired in the armed forces. Formal efforts of this kind should, in the task

force's view, be expanded and disseminated more widely to those who operate and participate in voluntary education programs. The states should spearhead cooperation and coordination in order to make this happen.

V. CIVILIAN INSTITUTIONS AS A RESOURCE

The military clientele represents continuity of support and participation

The voluntary education program in the military represents both an opportunity and a cause of concern for civilian postsecondary institutions. From a financial standpoint, the opportunity is manifest. As the preliminary cost study appended to this report demonstrates, the voluntary education program can create substantial revenue for postsecondary institutions without requiring proportionate increases in the fixed administrative burden or personnel costs of such institutions. In a time of nationwide fiscal stress in postsecondary education, the military clientele represents a source of continuity of support and participation. For some institutions, especially those situated near a base or installation of one of the armed forces, military personnel may constitute a sizable portion of class enrollments and, over time, these students can be relied upon to pursue actively a variety of programs as they seek to attain their educational and career goals.

On the other hand, the voluntary education program is a cause of concern for postsecondary institutions. First, there are questions concerning the relationship of programs to the traditional role and scope of each institution. A great infusion of programs and expectations from another segment of society — the federal government through its armed forces — could have an impact on the identity and educational mission that institutions have built up over time. This concern also extends to an institution's rules and procedures for internal determination of program and degree requirements, eligibility of students, policy matters such as transferability and acceptance of transfer credits and quality control procedures. Thus the recommendations made by this task force are integrally related to the ability of institutions to meet, at least in part, the massive educational needs of the armed forces in their voluntary education program, while at the same time maintaining a vital and independent method of operation.

Postsecondary institutions have a duty to adapt to changing educational needs and program requirements. But the process of adapting should not result in any long-term erosion of their role in educational decision making and program formulation, particularly when major governmental interests and leverage are involved. Nationwide and state policies on education for military personnel should foster variety and excellence among postsecondary institutions. Such policies should aim to strengthen institutional decision making and evaluation, with the ultimate aim of providing better educational opportunities for the individual serviceman and woman. All policies and procedures relating to the provision of civilian educational services to military personnel should, in the task force's view, reflect a balanced assessment of the compatibility of armed forces objectives and expectations with civilian institutional capabilities and needs. The task force strongly supports a firm continuing Department of Defense commitment to maintain the voluntary education program in the military services for the development of human resources, complemented by a military education program aimed at inculcating skills for military objectives. Any goals, policies or guidelines at the federal level should be built on this premise. Even in a time of budget constraints and fiscal austerity at all levels, it is critically important that the military's voluntary education program remain in tune with the broad social purposes of postsecondary education in this country.

Education for the development of human resources

The task force commends the sensitivity and cooperative spirit of military authorities in this regard, and hopes that past successes can be strengthened in

the future. Through liaison and straightforward discussion, key officials in the Department of Defense and other military representatives have demonstrated a commitment to effective accommodation with civilian postsecondary education. This commitment is apparent also in the operation of the Servicemen's Opportunity College, which has required military-civilian cooperation on a large scale. Of particular interest in the SOC effort are the criteria worked out in conjunction with military needs and agreed to by each postsecondary institution that becomes a member of the consortium offering programs to military personnel. These criteria — such as liberal entrance requirements, provision for off-campus courses and nontraditional study, counseling and tutorial services, adaptable residency requirements, a credit transfer policy and several others — show that there is common ground between military needs and civilian institutional capabilities.

As one way of extending the cooperation exemplified by the Servicemen's Opportunity College, the task force reiterates its recommendation that a national advisory council and base advisory committees be formed to provide input from institutions and the postsecondary education community with regard to planning, needs assessment, policy formulation and evaluation for the voluntary education program of the military. Inasmuch as communication is essential for effective coordination of civilian educational services for military personnel, these committees should work actively at the policy level in all phases of voluntary education in the states. None of the problems described in this report is beyond solution if cooperative mechanisms are implemented. A great many questions not addressed in this report, such as the redirection of federal student aid for military personnel or issues involved in the development by the military of its own educational institutions (e.g., the Community College of the Air Force), are capable of resolution only if military authorities, education officials and state leaders work together to clarify needs and identify constructive courses of action.

None of the problems described in this report is beyond solution

During its year of deliberations on educational opportunity for military personnel, as it moved from enumeration of problems to identification of solutions, the task force often noted the similarity between its particular area of concern and some general trends in postsecondary education today. The need for explicit definitions of mission and purpose, backed by a clear policy framework and realistic criteria for decision making and operation; the need to articulate both the differences and the shared concerns among disparate sectors, segments and interests with often variant expectations for postsecondary education; the need to establish acceptable standards and procedures for evaluation and redesign; the need to construct systems of financing and fiscal accountability that will insure access and stability as well as stimulate the highest possible effectiveness in relation to actual cost; and the need to adapt postsecondary education to changing exigencies, while at the same time maintaining continuity in the pursuit of excellence and equality of opportunity — all of these needs are inextricably related to and reflected in the current effort to increase the postsecondary educational opportunities of military personnel. The task force hopes, therefore, that federal, state and institutional authorities will actively seek to carry out its recommendations at every level and with respect to every pertinent aspect of postsecondary education as it affects the learning opportunities of men and women of the armed forces.

Relation to other trends in postsecondary education

APPENDIX A

COST STUDY – THE NAVY'S VOLUNTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM

This study of the Navy's voluntary education program and the analysis of selected information on the tuition assistance program was undertaken at the request of the task force to: (1) reflect the scope of the voluntary education program, (2) trace dollars expended and enrollment of Navy personnel to civilian institutions, (3) determine the impact on colleges and universities where there are large enrollments of Navy personnel, and (4) show the degree of involvement by public and private institutions in Navy programs. This study was conducted and the report prepared by James D. Broman, Senior Consultant of the Servicemen's Opportunity College. The report was submitted to the task force by one of its members, William L. Maloy, principal civilian advisor on education and training, Naval Education and Training Command.

At the time this assignment was accepted, it was thought that data would be available from the Navy in such form that sampling techniques could be employed. Unfortunately, this was not the case regarding the tuition assistance activities at civilian institutions. This part of the study had to be undertaken by selecting several of many Navy regional disbursing offices, dividing individual tuition assistance contracts extracted from a chronological filing and sorting these contracts several times into desired categories of state, school term (fall, winter and summer) and class of instruction taken by Navy enrollees at each institution. Tabulations then could be made of student enrollments by school, together with dollars paid for courses taken, and the impact of Navy enrollments in each class of instruction could be assessed.

For Program for Afloat College Education (PACE) and the Instructor Hire Program, aggregate figures and related information appear adequate for the purposes of this study.

Program Afloat College Education (PACE)

In fiscal year 1975, three private institutions and three public institutions were awarded six contracts under competitive bidding. Of the total dollars authorized under these contracts for PACE, 78 percent, or $1,796,425, went to private institutions. The following table shows contract awards for fiscal years 1974 and 1975:

Institutions	Authorized Contracts (Expenditures close to below figures)	
	FY 75	FY 74
Chapman College (California)	$1,153,964	$ 897,750
George Washington University (D.C.)	530,485	237,050
University of Hartford (Connecticut)	111,976	85,915
University of Hawaii	179,855	136,800
University of South Carolina	181,621	78,000
University of North Florida	123,882	78,285*
	$2,281,783	$1,513,800
*Florida State University FY 74	*(17,343 enrolled)*	*(13,000 enrolled)*

Instructor Hire Program

This program is a very small part of the voluntary education program of the Navy. Instructors are hired to provide instruction for noncredit courses, usually located on the military installation. No educational institutions are directly involved in the financial aspects of this program except that college personnel sometimes give assistance in securing qualified instructors after the course has been approved by the base commander. Much of the program operates overseas.

Expenditures for fiscal years 1974 and 1975, as well as projected funding for 1976 are as follows:

Year	Amount	Participants
FY 74	$17,848	1,131
FY 75	$15,799	1,003
FY 76 (estimated)	$33,000	2,000

Tuition Assistance Program

More than 500 colleges and universities re-

ceived payments through tuition assistance during fiscal year 1975 from the $2,077,000 expended by the Navy on behalf of 27,693 military participants. In fiscal year 1974, $1,766,000 was expended on behalf of 21,460 participants. Under this program, the participant pays 25 percent of the tuition; therefore, expenditures by Navy represent 75 percent of the total tuition paid to the institution.

Tuition assistance authorization contracts are filed at Ellyson Center at Pensacola, Florida, according to disbursing centers (approximately 20) in numerical order as they are received from these authorizing commands. Amendments to contracts are filed separately. Since there was no way to review all 27,000 contracts under the time restrictions of this study, disbursements made through the Commandant, 8th Naval District, New Orleans, Louisiana through the Education and Training Support Centers Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia, were selected for total review. Another decision was made to review contracts approved for California and the state of Washington by the Education and Training Support Center, San Diego, California. Plans to review contracts for Pensacola Junior College and the University of West Florida were abandoned for lack of time.

The mechanics required to arrange these contracts for this study were as follows: (1) amendments had to be refiled with the original contract; (2) contracts, together with amendments, had to be sorted into states; (3) state categories had to be sorted into colleges; (4) colleges had to be divided into college terms; (5) course enrollments had to be reviewed to determine impact of military personnel enrollments; and (6) dollars paid to a college (total tuition used) and number of persons participating were tabulated for each college.

For purposes of this study, "impaction" is defined as that situation where more than nine Navy personnel were enrolled in any class under the tuition assistance program. While it is possible to set another figure of what causes an institution to establish additional classes or sections, this figure of 10 or more Navy enrollees can be defended as a reasonable (perhaps even conservative) point at which impaction should be recognized. Navy enrollments below impaction level, spread over the many classes normally offered by a college or university, bring significant monetary benefits to civilian institutions, the magnitude of which is in direct proportion to tuition rate charged.

In the tables below, asterisks have been used for public colleges and universities that experienced impaction (as defined above).

Total Tuition Received by Colleges and Universities in Fiscal Year 1975

Commandant, 8th Naval District, New Orleans

Texas

	Students	Amount
Public 4-Year Institutions		
Texas T&I (Corpus Christi)	37	$ 2,200
(Kingsville)	80	4,800
Eight Other Public 4-Year Colleges and Universities	13	700
Subtotals	130	$ 7,700
Public 2-Year Colleges		
Mt. View Community College (Dallas)	24	$ 900
Del Mar College*	100	2,800
Bee County College*	201	9,200
Fifteen Other Public 2-Year Colleges	48	1,500
Subtotals	373	$14,400
Private Institutions		
Georgia Military College (Kingsville)	215	$23,100
Webster College (Corpus Christi)	15	6,100
Eight Other Private Colleges and Universities	14	3,300
Subtotals	244	$32,500

Louisiana

Public 4-Year Institutions		
University of New Orleans	54	$ 4,300
Three Other Public 4-Year Universities	8	300
Subtotals	62	$ 4,600
Public 2-Year Colleges		
Delgado Junior College	41	$ 2,600

*Public institutions that experienced an impact due to nine or more Navy personnel enrolled in specific classes of instruction.

Louisiana (continued)

	Students	Amount
Private Institutions		
Loyola University	15	$ 4,100
Our Lady of Holy Cross	22	2,400
Tulane University	8	1,500
Two Other Private Institutions	4	200
Subtotals	49	$ 8,200
Oklahoma		
Eight Colleges and Universities	8	$ 1,300
New Mexico		
Four Colleges and Universities	32	$ 2,300
Total 8th Naval District	**939**	**$73,600**

Virginia (continued)

	Students	Amount
Public 2-Year Colleges		
Tidewater Community College*	776	$ 52,200
Two Other 2-Year Colleges	29	1,800
Subtotals	805	$ 54,000
Private Institutions		
St. Leo College (Florida)	129	$ 12,000
Georgia Military College	20	2,200
Golden Gate University (California)	143	5,200
Eight Other Private Institutions	35	8,100
Subtotals	327	$ 27,500
Miscellaneous		
Five Institutions Overseas	33	$ 3,400
Total Norfolk Training District	**2,314**	**$214,800**

Education and Training Support, Norfolk, Virginia

West Virginia		
Two State 4-Year Institutions	19	$ 900
North Carolina		
One 4-year and 2 Community Colleges	26	$ 1,600
Maryland		
Two 4-Year and Four 2-Year Institutions	60	$ 4,900
Washington, D.C.		
George Washington University	70	$ 19,100
Kentucky		
University of Louisville	3	$ 600
Virginia		
Public 4-Year Institutions		
Old Dominion University*	825	$ 88,800
Norfolk State College*	66	5,800
William and Mary College	39	5,500
University of Virginia	41	2,700
Subtotals	971	$102,800

Education and Training Support Center San Diego, California

California		
Public 4-Year Institutions		
University of California System (nine institutions)	115	$ 12,800
California State College System (eight campuses)	39	3,800
San Diego State University	81	7,400
Subtotals	235	$ 24,000
Public 2-Year Colleges		
Southwestern College	155	$ 20,700
Ventura College	48	7,300
Gavilan College*	36	4,600
Solano Community College	24	3,200
Monterey Peninsula College	17	1,700
City College of San Francisco	19	2,900
College of Alameda	15	2,200
Mesa College	39	7,800
City College of San Diego	19	3,400
Meramar College	5	1,200
Thirteen Other Community Colleges	47	4,500
Subtotals	424	$ 59,500

*Public institutions that experienced an impact due to nine or more Navy personnel enrolled in specific classes of instruction.

California (continued)

	Students	Amount
Private Institutions		
Chapman College	892	$186,900
La Verne College	175	35,500
University of San Diego	146	41,900
U.S. International University	47	18,400
Golden Gate University	65	11,600
California Lutheran College	32	4,700
Unversity of Southern California	18	7,500
Pepperdine University	27	13,600
Twelve Other Private Institutions	43	11,800
Subtotals	1,445	$331,900
Washington		
Public 4-Year Institutions		
Three Only	31	$ 3,300
Public 2-Year Colleges		
Skagit Valley College*	620	$ 23,900
Olympic College*	457	20,100
Seattle Community College District (all campuses)	23	1,100
Thirteen Other Community Colleges	55	3,100
Subtotals	1,155	$ 48,200
Private Institutions		
Chapman College	37	$ 5,600
Three Other Private Institutions	5	700
Subtotals	42	$ 6,300
California Total	2,104	$415,400
Washington Total	1,228	57,800
Total San Diego Training Center	3,332	$473,200

Comments and Conclusions of Navy Report

A. The impact of enrollments of Navy personnel (as hereinafter defined), under the tuition assistance program of the military, on individual public institutions was not significant during the 1974-75 academic year.

1. Only eight public colleges and universities in four states were affected:

Texas

Del Mar College — In the winter term, there were 16 Navy enrollees in one English class.

Bee County College — In the fall term, there were 20 Navy enrollees in English composition, 15 in a history class, and 11 in general psychology.

Virginia

Old Dominion University — Fall term enrollments of Navy personnel were: psychology 32, accounting 18, English 33, and 12 in another psychology class. Winter term had: English 29, mathematics 21, accounting 15, psychology 11, and economics 10. Spring term: only one class (IA305) with 18 Navy personnel enrolled. Summer term: 19 Navy enrollees in one introductory English course.

Norfolk State College — The fall term only: mathematics had 11 Navy enrollees and psychology had 12.

Tidewater Community College — Fall term: sociology had 25, psychology 27, business administration 19, accounting 20, economics 16, English (101) had 10, and English (111) had 32. Winter term: economics 16, accounting (211) had 14, accounting (214) had 14, and English (111) had 19. Spring term: business administration 19, psychology 13, and psychology class had 13; English (112) had 13, and English (111) had 21. Summer term: economics 16, accounting (211) had 14, and English (111) had 19.

California

Gavilian College — Had one class with more than nine Navy personnel enrolled. This appeared to be a special class set up for Navy personnel at a San Diego Navy facility.

Washington

Skagit Valley College — Fall term: English 25, and four other classes had in excess of ten Navy enrollees (law enforcement, real estate, auto tuneup and psychology). Winter term: a psychology class and a natural science class had enrollments over nine Navy personnel.

Olympic College — Winter term: algebra 10 and English 15. Spring term: Both English (101) and (102) had over 10 Navy personnel enrolled.

2. The review of approximately 7,500 tuition assistance authorization contracts (representing 26.5 percent of Navy's fiscal year 1975 tuition expenditures) processed by three Navy disbursement centers, showed only minor impact on two 4-year public institutions (Norfolk State and Old Dominion) and on three community colleges (Skagit Valley and Olympic in the state of Washington and Tidewater in Virginia). This impact, in all cases, was more than offset by many other Navy personnel enrolled in many other classes regularly offered by the institutions.

3. While there is a high probability that

*Public institutions that experienced an impact due to nine or more Navy personnel enrolled in specific classes of instruction.

there are other military personnel from other branches of the service that increase the level of impaction at these colleges and universities, there is a like probability that the same pattern of enrollment distribution would come into play and thereby more than compensate for additional impaction.

4. Impaction in almost every instance occurred in introductory type courses in social science, English and business administration. These course offerings normally operate as high enrollment classes; therefore, this also tends to cushion the effect of impaction by military personnel.

5. Classes of instruction affected by Navy enrollments are normally those high demand classes offered by the institution, many times in more than one section each term. This too tends to cushion impaction from military enrollments and may even help a college to schedule its offerings.

B. Cost information regarding differences between public and private colleges and universities was developed as a part of the study. It is well known that private institutions most utilized by military personnel participating in the tuition assistance program, exercise a great deal of initiative in promoting their education programs and providing classes of instruction for military personnel. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that their involvement is a "paying" enterprise, especially because of the much higher tuitions charged by private institutions. This situation develops a reluctance on the part of public institutions near to military installations "to compete" with private colleges and universities, for fiscal reasons alone. The following cost comparisons have a bearing on this situation:

1. In Texas, Georgia Military College (located in the Southeastern section of the country) had the largest enrollment of Navy personnel through tuition assistance, a total of 215 students producing tuition income to the college of $23,100. On the other hand, public four-year institutions in Texas served only 130 Navy personnel at a cost of $7,700 in total tuition. Two-year community colleges in Texas served 373 Navy personnel at a cost of $14,400, making a total of 503 Navy personnel served by all public postsecondary institutions in Texas at a total tuition cost of $22,100. Comparing these enrollments, two times the number of Navy personnel were served by public institutions in Texas as were served at the same cost by Georgia Military College, a private institution located several thousand miles away.

2. In California, Chapman College enrolled 892 Navy personnel receiving tuition of $186,900. In Virginia, 891 Navy personnel were enrolled in Old Dominion University (825) and Norfolk State College (66), for a total tuition cost at these two public four-year institutions of $94,600. This shows that Chapman College served the same number of Navy personnel as did the two public institutions at approximately two times the cost.

3. In the state of Washington, two community colleges, Skagit Valley College and Olympic College, enrolled 1,177 Navy personnel at tuition costs aggregating $44,000 (620 at Skagit Valley at $23,900 tuition income, and 457 at Olympic at $20,100 tuition income). In California, Chapman College, La Verna College and U.S. International University enrolled approximately the same number of Navy personnel (1,114), receiving $240,800 tuition income. It cost the Navy, and its personnel enrolled under tuition assistance in the three private institutions in California, about six times more than for a comparable number of Navy personnel attending the two public community colleges in Washington.

C. It should be recognized that there are some smaller cities and communities, located near large military installations, that have disproportionately high military populations. Because the local economy in these situations is so dependent on defense budgets and spending of military personnel and federal employees, nearby public postsecondary educational institutions are most cooperative and in some cases treat military personnel as a bona fide part of their local civilian population. In many cases, resident tuition for military personnel is permitted, scheduling is arranged for their convenience and in some instances branch campuses are established either on the military installation or at a convenient nearby location.

D. It appears that some financial incentive should be given public institutions, which have opportunity by reason of physical location, to expand service to military personnel. Such a plan should be designed to:

1. Provide additional funds where military enrollments impact on a public institution.

2. Provide allowance to compensate for other funding lost if special accommodations are made to serve military personnel (such as in California where community colleges are not paid by the state when students are served on a military installation, which is technically out of the legal jurisdiction of the community college district).

3. Allow special bonuses to public institutions which offer programs on base, or at convenient locations to military installations.

E. Governors and their planning and budget offices rely heavily on state postsecondary education coordinating agencies. Therefore, these coordinating agencies (vocational as well as academic) should be thoroughly aware of the scope and magnitude of the voluntary education program of the military and its effect on institutions in their own state. Not only will this foster support for the voluntary education program and help eliminate restrictions imposed on public institutions, but a total awareness on the part of state agencies will open new sources of information of the capabilities of public colleges and universities to education service offices at military installations.

F. For management information purposes, it would be desirable to put tuition assistance data into a data bank or at least on punch cards. If this was done for all branches of the military on a uniform basis, appropriate studies could be made with relative ease and information could be readily available for planning purposes. With the demise of the G.I. Bill, many believe that the voluntary education program of the military will become the primary tool for recruiters. Given the prospect of much greater expenditures in the future, information must be readily available for planning and control.

APPENDIX B
RESOURCE CONSULTANTS INVOLVED IN TASK FORCE MEETINGS

Colonel Robert T. Boyette
Director of Voluntary Education
Office of the Assistant Secretary
of Defense

Captain John Brick
Director of Voluntary Education
Navy Campus for Achievement

James Broman
Senior Consultant
Servicemen's Opportunity College

Tilton Davis
Director, Academic Division
Education Directorate
U.S. Army

Andy Edmonson
Director of Education
U.S. Army
Fort Bragg, North Carolina

Colonel Lyle D. Kaapke
President
Community College of the Air Force

Lieutenant Colonel John M. Keenan
Head, Education Services Branch
U.S. Marine Corps

Jerry W. Miller
Director
Office of Educational Credit
American Council on Education

Robert Quick
Director of Education
U.S. Air Force

Eugene I. Van Antwerp
Staff Associate
The Council on Postsecondary
Accreditation

Education Commission of the States

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact in 1966. Forty-five states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are now members. Its goal is to further a working relationship among governors, state legislators and educators for the improvement of education. This report is an outcome of one of many Commission undertakings at all levels of education. The Commission offices are located at 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295.